

---

Is Official Development Assistance to Middle Income Countries Pro-Poor?

A focus on South Korea

A Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School

of Cornell University

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Public Administration

by

Woohyoung Kim

May 2018

---

---

© 2018 Woohyoung Kim

---

---

## ABSTRACT

Considering the enormous number of the poor in Middle Income Countries (MICs) and their limited resources, it is impossible to end global poverty without supporting the poor in MICs. Thus, ODA should play an important role to support them, and this can be achieved when ODA programmes/projects to MICs are based on pro-poor growth by targeting the poor segments of MICs. To know if ODA given to MICs really contributes to pro-poor growth, I analyzed both the planning and disbursement stages focusing on the case of South Korea. (As a result), I found that ODA from South Korea prioritized to support the poor when they established strategies for MICs. However, the priority for the poor was not clear when projects for MICs were chosen and implemented.

---

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Woohyoung Kim was born in Seoul, South Korea. He received a BA in Economics from Yonsei University. He has been working for KOICA, the Korean government's development agency headquartered in Seongnam, South Korea since 2009. He has worked on the agency's official development assistance programmes for Latin America at the Latin America Department and the Paraguay Office. Now he is studying at Cornell University for a Master of Public Administration with a concentration in Economic and Financial Policy. His research interests include, but are not limited to, development policies for developing countries in Latin America and evaluation for development assistance programmes

---

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am especially grateful to my loving family, Seulbi and Ian. This Thesis would not have been possible without their love and encouragement. Also, I would like to thank my dad, Hyunkoo and my mom, Kyungsook for their support and dedication.

I am grateful to all of those who taught me and provided extensive guidance at Cornell, especially, my thesis advisor, Professor John Mathiason. Also, I thank KOICA and CIPA for giving me this great opportunity and the financial support to study at Cornell.

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	vii
PREFACE.....	viii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
BACKGROUND.....	5
METHODOLOGY.....	11
MAIN RESULTS	
COUNTRY PARTNERSHIP STRATEGY.....	13
INCOME/INEQUALITY AND AID RELATIONSHIP.....	18
BILATERAL PROJECTS OF KOICA.....	23
CONCLUSION.....	26
REFERENCES.....	29
APENDIX.....	33

---

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Priority Partner Countries of South Korea by Income Group.....	11
Table 2. Pro-Poor Priority Sectors of CPS.....	15
Table 3. Relationship between Income/Inequality and the Proportion of ODA Projects implemented through NGOs.....	20
Table 4. Relationship between Income/Inequality and the Proportion of ODA Projects Aimed at Gender Equality.....	23

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BMZ.....	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development
CPS.....	Country Partnership Strategy
DAC.....	Development Assistance Committee
EC .....	European Commission
EU .....	European Union
HIPC.....	Heavily Indebted Poor Countries
IMF.....	International Monetary Fund
KOICA.....	Korea International Cooperation Agency
LDCs.....	Least Developed Countries
LIC.....	Low Income Countries
LMICs.....	Low Middle Income Countries
MICs.....	Middle Income Countries
ODA.....	Official Development Assistance
OECD.....	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OLICs.....	Other Low Income Countries
UMICs.....	Upper Middle Income Countries
UN.....	United Nations



---

## PREFACE

This Thesis is the result of my multidisciplinary coursework at CIPA, Cornell University and an independent study guided by my thesis advisor Professor John Mathiason. The diverse courses of CIPA, including international public administration, helped me expand my knowledge on international development more deeply.

In addition to my studies at CIPA, my experience in the field of international development contributed to this Thesis. Since I started working on ODA projects for Latin America, where most countries are middle income countries, I have been interested in how ODA could contribute to the sustainable development of middle income countries, where a huge part of the world's poor lives.

It was a great fortune to have an opportunity to combine what I learned at Cornell University and what I experienced in the field and write this Thesis.

## Introduction

According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 28 member countries of the organization's Development Assistance Committee (DAC) spent \$131.6 billion on Official Development Assistance (ODA) in 2015 to support the socio-economic development of developing countries. This amount is equal to 0.03% of the gross national income of the 28 member countries<sup>1</sup>.

When analyzing in terms of income groups<sup>2</sup>, Middle Income Countries (MICs) received a large part of the total ODA in 2015 in spite of the declining trend of aid to MICs<sup>3</sup> and international declarations to increase ODA to Least Developed Countries (LDCs) including 2011 Istanbul Programme of Action for LDCs<sup>4</sup> adopted in Istanbul, Turkey.

In 2015, developing countries received \$94.2 billion, and multilateral recipients received \$37.3 billion out of the \$131.6 billion. Out of the \$94.2 billion,

---

<sup>1</sup> The ODA data reported by DAC member countries are available on the International Development Statistics (IDS) online databases of OECD (<http://www.oecd.org/development/stats/idsonline.htm>).

<sup>2</sup> In this thesis, the income group classification follows the DAC List of ODA Recipients of OECD effective as at 1 January 2015 for reporting on 2014, 2015 and 2016 flows. The DAC List of ODA Recipients shows all countries and territories eligible to receive official development assistance (ODA). The countries consist of all low and middle income countries based on gross national income (GNI) per capita as published by the World Bank, with the exception of G8 members, EU members, and countries with a firm date for entry into the EU. The list also includes all of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) as defined by the UN. (<http://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/daclist.htm>)

<sup>3</sup> ODA to MICs has been declined from \$49.3 to \$25.9 billion between 2005 and 2015.

<sup>4</sup> Donor countries are recommended to provide 0.15 to 0.20 percent of their gross national production (GNP) as ODA to LDCs under the Programme of Action.

53.1 billion was disbursed to support specific developing countries. Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and Other Low Income Countries (LICs) received 51.16 percent, whereas Lower Middle Income Countries and Territories (LMICs) and Upper Middle Income Countries (UMICs) received 48.84 percent.

This trend where a significant amount of ODA goes to MICs is likely to continue in the long term for several reasons. First, donor countries have been allocating a significant part of their budget to support MICs for a long time. This trend is stable and not easy to change rapidly. From 1990 to 2015, MICs received 60.4 percent of total ODA distributed to specific countries on average between 74.8 percent (the highest in 2005) and 45.3 percent (the lowest in 2013).

Secondly, aid to MICs is critical to reducing global poverty. Now, MICs are home to 5 billion people and home to 72 percent of the world's poor. (Sumner, 2011) Thus, it is impossible to end global poverty without addressing this huge group of the poor.

Thirdly, it has been hard for MICs to develop further and graduate from the recipient list. When comparing the OECD DAC recipient list of 2006 and 2014, only seven countries and territories (Barbados, Croatia, Oman, Saudi Arabia, St. Kitts-Nevis, Trinidad and Tobago, and Turks and Caicos Islands) out of 75 LMICs and UMICs as of 2006 graduated from the List by 2016 and 68 countries and territories still remained in the list.

Thus, the focus should be how to provide better-targeted aid to the poor in MICs rather than whether the donor countries should continue or stop supporting MICs. Most MICs have a high level of inequality and a massive number of poor people and this hinders the robust growth of the MICs. The average GINI coefficient of the 72 MICs reached 41.83. UMICs and LMICs recorded 43.3 and 39.99 respectively<sup>5</sup>. Considering that the average GINI coefficient of OECD countries reached 31.8, the inequality level of MICs is very high and of great concern for the MICs and the world.

In this regard, most DAC donor countries have developed differentiated strategies for ODA to MICs. For example, the Belgian government announced its priority cooperation domains for development cooperation in MICs including the political and social empowerment of underprivileged, vulnerable, left out civilians in 2013. Also, The European Commission (EC) introduced the 'differentiation' policy for MICs meaning (1) new aid allocation criteria; and (2) differentiated development partnerships for different categories of countries (Glennie, 2011; Herbert, 2012)

These general strategies provide the basis for donor countries to provide better targeted aid to MICs. However, it would be more interesting to analyze the strategies of each donor country to each recipient country and the actual

---

<sup>5</sup> Data are from DataBank provided by the World Bank (<http://databank.worldbank.org/data/home.aspx#>) and the latest available GINI coefficient of each country was used to calculate the average.

disbursement of the ODA resources to determine whether the DAC donor countries really target the poor when they provide ODA to MICs. In an attempt to investigate this question, I analyzed both the planning and disbursement stages of ODA to MICs focusing on the case of South Korea.

I focused on South Korea for two reasons. First, South Korea has expanded its volume of ODA rapidly, so its importance in the field of international development has grown. The Korean government provided \$366 million in ODA (\$146 million for grant aid) in 2003, and in 2015, the amount reached \$1,915 million (\$960 million for grant aid). The ODA/GNI ratio has increased from 0.06 percent to 0.14 percent during this period as well.

Also, South Korea tries to follow the internationally agreed guidelines on ODA to improve its aid effectiveness and lead the international discussion for better aid as the government's White Paper of the year 2017 clearly states. In this regard, the government joined the OECD DAC in 2010 and hosted a series of international meetings on ODA including the Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effective, where the Busan Partnership for Effective Development Co-operation was agreed.

South Korea, like other DAC member countries, provides a large part of grant aid to MICs. In 2015, the country provided \$639 million in ODA to MICs, which represented 43.6 percent of its bilateral ODA. Also, 13 countries out of its 24 priority partner countries are MICs.

However, despite the importance, the government's policy on ODA to MICs, such as aid type, priority sector, and delivery channel, is not very clear.<sup>6</sup> "The Strategic Plan for Development Cooperation and Mid-term Strategy for Development Cooperation (2016-2020)" do not state about its policies on ODA to MICs. The White Paper of the year 2017 states that the government has increased ODA to LDCs, OLICs, and especially, HIPC. Yet, it does not state its policy on distribution by income groups either.

### **Background**

When ODA to MICs targets the poor and help them eradicate poverty, ODA can be an important mean of reducing global poverty not only by directly providing necessary resources to the poor but also by helping MICs continue sustainable growth on their own.

One of the obstacles MICs are facing is the prevalent poverty of the lower classes and inequality caused by poverty. There has been considerable research on the effects of inequality on economic growth. Cingano (2014) suggests that inequality has a significantly negative impact on economic growth and especially, what matters most is the gap between low income households and the rest of the population.

---

<sup>6</sup> The documents found on the website of the Office of Government Policy Coordination have been analyzed. (<http://www.odakorea.go.kr/eng.policy.Legal.do>)

Also, Ostry (2014) shows that lower net inequality is correlated with faster growth for a given level of redistribution. Halter, Oechslin, and Zweimüller (2011) investigate empirical data on the inequality and growth relationship and conclude that higher inequality helps growth in the short term but the long-run (or total) effect of higher inequality is negative.

Given this negative relationship between inequality and growth, Sumner (2011) explains that there are still good reasons why the international community should continue to provide ODA to MICs. First, aid should be provided where poverty exists. Second, aid to MICs can help resolve negative externality that may harm low income countries (LICs). Third, donor agencies gain knowledge that can be useful for aid to LICs by working with MICs. Fourth, global power relations disadvantage MICs.

Considering the rationale for ODA to MICs, it is essential to be pro-poor when the international community provides the scarce ODA resource to MICs, which usually have more resources and better institutions than LDCs/OLICs. A significant part of ODA to MICs should be provided for the poorest and the most vulnerable groups to achieve the goal of ODA and help MICs achieve pro-poor growth.

Being pro-poor is multidimensional and implies various objectives and values. For example, the paper prepared by the four globally important institutions

including the UN, "A Better World for All: Progress towards the international development goals" (IMF, 2010) states that being pro-poor has to 'generate more income-earning opportunities so that poor people can engage in productive and well-paid work; give poor people more access to assets to help unleash their productive potential and allow them to feed themselves; fair in creating better opportunities for poor women'. (p. 21)

Thus, pro-poor and pro-poor growth is hard to define and measure, and there is no clearly agreed definition. (Jung, 2011, Kakwani, Khandker & Son, 2004) Yet, there are two definitions and measures that are widely cited: absolute and relative definition. (ODI, 2008) The absolute definition is that when the economic condition of the poor improves, it is pro-poor. On the other hand, according to the relative definition, income of the poor must rise faster than the rich to be pro-poor. (Ravallion, 2014)

Grosse, Harttgen and Klasen (2008) suggest three definitions of pro-poor growth by dividing absolute pro-poor growth into weak and strong absolute pro-poor growth. Pro-poor growth in the weak absolute sense means that the growth rates are above zero for the poor. Weak pro-poor growth means that the growth rates are above zero for the poor, and strong pro-poor growth means that absolute increases of the poor are larger than the average and it implies reduced absolute inequality.



Nevertheless, pro-poor growth is broadly defined as growth that benefits the poor and helps reduce poverty. Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) of Germany states that 'pro-poor growth is a strategic approach whereby economic growth is specifically used to reduce poverty. The focus is on promoting the economic potential of (extremely) poor and disadvantaged people.' (p. 2).

With the growing interest in pro-poor growth, there is a considerable amount of literature on the role of ODA in the development of developing countries. However, most papers have focused on traditional donor countries and few studies have been published on emerging donors including South Korea.

The ODA strategies of the Korean government also aims pro-poor growth and target the poor in developing countries. Framework Act on International Development Cooperation enacted in January 2010 clarifies that there are four primary purposes of its ODA: (1) poverty reduction and quality of life improvement, (2) institutional development, (3) fostering friendly and cooperative relationship, (4) contribution to resolving global issues.

In addition, the Strategic Plan for International Development Cooperation (2010) of the government states that there are three core values. One of the values is 'Hope to Developing Countries' by 'focusing on poverty eradication and self-reliance'. Even though poverty reduction or poverty eradication is not the only

purpose or value of its ODA, it is clearly one of the primary values. Thus, Korea's ODA seemingly aims to promote pro-poor growth.

Then, one important question would be: "Has this strategy been put into its ODA programmes/projects?" The OECD DAC conducted a peer review of South Korea in 2012 (OECD, 2012) and suggested that 'over the last five years Korea has been increasing its aid to least developed countries (LDCs) and other low-income countries (LICs), particularly heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC); it should sustain this trend'. (p. 50) However, they did not evaluate how pro-poor the aid from South Korea was and they did not suggest policies on aid to MICs.

A number of studies investigated the characteristics of ODA from South Korea. Lumsdaine and Schopf (2007) claim that the Korean government had employed ODA to gain political and diplomatic advantages in relation to North Korea in the initial years and to seek economic gain by expanding trade ties in the early 1990s. However, with rising values of giving and the development of the civil society, humanitarian values have been fostered.

Chun, Munyi and Lee (2010) point out that a larger amount of aid does not go to the poorest countries due to domestic pressure to use aid more 'strategically' to gain economic benefits. They suggest that 'Korea should also pay more attention to fighting against poverty and disease in the LDCs, especially in Africa'. (p. 799)

Jung (2011) investigates the orientation of around 4,000 programmes/projects which had been implemented in 2009 and 2010 by KOICA to test whether they really aim at pro-poor growth. With the result, Jung concludes that less than 15 percent of the projects directly targets poverty reduction and between 71.9 to 76 percent<sup>7</sup> targeted poverty reduction comprehensively using the national poverty reduction markers of BMZ (GIZ, 2014). Jung then recommends increasing directly targeted poverty reduction projects.

The study of Kim and Oh (2012) explores the determinants of ODA from South Korea. They conclude that 'its aid is based more on the donor's interest for high-income recipient countries, while its aid for the middle-income group showed recipient nations' needs'. (p. 251) They made an important contribution by breaking down recipient countries into groups based on their national income level and analyzing them.

However, their claims seem to be somewhat superficial. The study investigates the portion of grant aid and concessional loans of the total ODA to test the motivation of ODA from South Korea. This approach assumes that grant aid is more humanitarian and concessional loans are more strategic economically and politically. This approach may be reasonable considering that there is less obligation when recipient countries receive grant aids than loans (OECD, 2008) Yet, their study might have been more convincing if they investigated the

---

<sup>7</sup> These figures depend on the definition of comprehensive poverty reduction.

characteristics of each grant aid and concessional loan programme/project, e.g. if the project targets the poor.

## Methodology

I analyzed both the documents published by the Korean government and data reported by them. This methodology allowed me to investigate the composition and characteristics of ODA to each recipient country. Also, it helped investigate the similarities and differences of ODA to MICs and ODA to other income groups. To do this, I focused on the two stages of ODA implementation: planning and disbursement.

Table 1

*Priority Partner Countries of South Korea by Income Group*

LDCs (11)		OLICs(-)	LMICs (10)		UMICs (3)
Cambodia	Mozambique		Viet Nam	Pakistan	Colombia
Bangladesh	Rwanda		Indonesia	Bolivia	Peru
Lao PDR	Uganda		Philippines	Paraguay	Azerbaijan
Nepal	Tanzania		Mongolia	Uzbekistan	
Myanmar	Senegal		Sri Lanka	Ghana	
Ethiopia					

For the planning stage, I analyzed the Country Partnership Strategy (CPS) for the year 2016 to 2020<sup>8</sup>. Currently, there are 24 priority partner countries which are composed of 11 Asian countries, 7 African countries, 4 Central and South American countries, and 2 Middle-Eastern and CIS countries. I compared the strategies for LDCs/OLICs and LMICs/UMICs and analyzed if there is a significant difference between strategies for LDCs and strategies for LMICS/UMICs.

Secondly, to see how ODA projects are chosen and implemented in practice, I examined whether the inequality and income level of recipient countries affects the characteristics of ODA to MICs. I analyzed the delivery channel and the purpose of the projects that the Korean government had implemented. For this analysis, I used the country-level data from the year 2015 that OECD DAC member countries reported to the DAC.

To analyze the relationship between the inequality/income level of recipient countries and the characteristics of ODA to MICs, a linear regression model was adopted for South Korea and for all other DAC member countries except for South Korea. This comparison enabled me to test whether there is a significant difference between ODA from South Korea and ODA from other donor countries.

---

<sup>8</sup> All CPSs can be found on the website of the Office for Government Policy Coordination. (<http://www.odakorea.go.kr/eng.policy.CountryPartnershipStrategy.do>)

Lastly, I analyzed the country-specific bilateral projects of the Korea International Cooperation Agency (KOICA), which plays the lead role in implementing grant aid programmes on behalf of the Korean government. The agency's annual budget is around \$600 million in 2017, and the budget for country-specific bilateral projects comprises around 40 percent of the total ODA of the agency. I assessed each project to determine whether the project supports the poor in the recipient country and linked the result to the inequality and income level of each recipient country.

## **Main Results**

### **Country Partnership Strategies**

To compare the strategy used for each recipient country, I translated the purposes, objectives, and outcomes of the CPS into a logical framework.<sup>9</sup> Generally, each CPS uses a similar structure, however, each CPS uses terminologies somewhat in a different way, thus it needs to be translated based on the standardized definition of purpose, objective, outcome, output, and activity.

All CPSs include summary, priority sectors and implementation strategy, assumptions, evaluation framework, mid-term allocation plan, and partnership plans. Among them, the summary shows the logical framework of the CPS. In all

---

<sup>9</sup> I used the logical framework suggested by "A Handbook on Results-Based Management for Sida Research Cooperation". (AIMS, 2014)

the CPSs, the ultimate goals are very similar. They aim at 'contributing to socio-economic development by aligning its objectives with partner countries' own national development plan' and this goal is supported by objectives. In each CPS, there are three to four objectives and each objective is supported by priority sectors and support plans.

Given the structure of the logical framework of the CPS, the 'support plans' should suggest what outputs should be produced as a result of their programmes/projects in the three to four priority sectors<sup>10</sup>. However, the current logical framework is somewhat confusing. In some cases, the 'support plans' include not only desired outputs but also outcomes, which are measurable but not directly controllable. Also, the 'objectives', which need to be supported by the 'support plans', include desired outputs and outcomes. For this reason, revised logical frameworks were proposed to analyze each strategy and compare them.

I focused on the 'priority sectors' of the CPSs and analyzed whether they were designed to support pro-poor growth and target the poor based on two definitions. First, based on a rigorous definition, a priority sector is regarded as a pro-poor sector if a specific minor target group (e.g., smallholders and family farmers, out-of-school girls and women) is defined, or the outcomes and objectives explicitly aim at supporting the poor (e.g., reduction of inequality or addressing urban poverty)

---

<sup>10</sup> I adopted the definition of each terminology of the logical framework suggested by AIMS (2014)

Also, I analyzed it by using a flexible definition. Based on the flexible definition, a priority sector is regarded as a pro-poor sector if a priority sector is considered pro-poor if a direct mean of intervention (e.g., access to clean water, basic health, and education system) is introduced, or the outcomes and objectives aim at supporting the poor or improving the welfare of the citizens explicitly or implicitly.

The result shows that 63 percent of the priority sectors of the CPSs for MICs aim at targeting the poor based on the rigorous definition, whereas 40 percent of them aim at targeting the poor based on the flexible definition.

Table 2

*Pro-Poor Priority Sectors of CPS*

Country	CPS priority sector	Pro-poor with the rigorous definition	Pro-poor with the flexible definition
Azerbaijan	ICT(Communications), Water Management and Public Health, Public Administration, Rural Development	Water Management and Public Health, Rural Development	Water Management and Public Health, Rural Development
Bangladesh	Education, Transport, Water Management and Public Health, ICT(Communications)	Education, Water Management and Public Health	Education, Water Management and Public Health
Bolivia	Health and Sanitation, Rural Development, Transportation, Energy	Health and Sanitation, Rural Development	Health and Sanitation, Rural Development
Cambodia	Transport, Water Management and Public Health, Education, Rural Development	Water Management and Public Health, Education, Rural Development	Education



Country	CPS priority sector	Pro-poor with the rigorous definition	Pro-poor with the flexible definition
Colombia	Regional Development, Transportation, Industrial Development, Post-Conflict	Regional Development, Post-Conflict	Regional Development, Post-Conflict
Ethiopia	Health and Sanitation, Rural Development, Transport and Energy, Education	Health and Sanitation, Rural Development, Education	Rural Development, Education
Ghana	Agriculture and Rural Development, Public Health, Education, Energy	Agriculture and Rural Development, Public Health, Education	Agriculture and Rural Development, Public Health
Indonesia	Transport, Governance (Public Administration), Environment Protection, Water Management	Transport, Environment Protection	Transport
Lao PDR	Water Management and Health, Energy, Education, Rural Development	Water Management and Health, Energy, Rural Development	Rural Development
Mongolia	Education, Water Management and Public Health, Governance (Public Administration), Transportation	Education, Water Management and Public Health	Education, Water Management and Public Health
Mozambique	Transport, Energy, Water Management and Health, Education	Water Management and Health, Education	Education
Myanmar	Governance, Rural Development, Transport, Energy	Governance, Rural Development, Transport	Rural Development, Transport
Nepal	Public Health, Education, Rural Development, Energy	Public Health, Rural Development	-
Pakistan	Transport, Energy, Water Management and Health, Rural Development	Water Management and Health, Rural Development	Rural Development
Paraguay	Water Management and Health, Transport, Rural and Urban Development, ICT (Communication)	Water Management and Health, Rural and Urban Development, ICT (Communication)	Rural and Urban Development, ICT (Communication)
Peru	Public Health, Governance (Public	Public Health, Climate Change and	Public Health

Country	CPS priority sector	Pro-poor with the rigorous definition	Pro-poor with the flexible definition
	Administration), Climate Change and Environment, Transport	Environment	
Philippines	Rural Development, Health and Sanitation, Transport, Disaster Prevention and Preparedness	Rural Development, Health and Sanitation, Disaster Prevention and Preparedness	Rural Development, Health and Sanitation
Rwanda	Education, Rural Development, ICT	Rural Development	-
Senegal	Rural Development/Agriculture and Fisheries, Education, Water Management and Health, Transport	Rural Development/Agriculture and Fisheries, Water Management and Health	Rural Development/Agriculture and Fisheries
Sri Lanka	Education, Transport, Water Management and Sanitation, Rural Development	Education, Water Management and Sanitation, Rural Development	Education, Water Management and Sanitation, Rural Development
Tanzania	Water Management and Health, Transport, Education, Energy	Water Management and Health, Education	Education
Uganda	Rural Development, Education, Health	Rural Development, Education, Health	Rural Development, Health
Uzbekistan	Education, Water Management and Health, Public Administration	Education, Water Management and Health	Water Management and Health
Vietnam	Transport, Water Management and Healthcare, Governance (Public Administration), Education	Transport, Water Management and Healthcare, Governance (Public Administration), Education	Transport, Governance (Public Administration), Education

When comparing LDCs and LMICs/UMICs, the difference between two groups is not significant based on the rigorous definition. On average, 63 percent of priority sectors for LMICs/UMICs are pro-poor whereas 62 percent of priority sectors for LDCs are pro-poor.

However, based on the flexible definition, there is a significant difference between LDCs and LMICs/UMICs. On average, 47 percent of priority sector for LMICs/UMICs are pro-poor whereas only 31 percent of priority sectors for LDCs are pro-poor.

In conclusion, during the planning stage, I found that the CPSs seemingly intend to promote pro-poor growth and target the poor. In both rigorous and flexible definitions, over 47 percent of the priority sectors are based on pro-poor growth and target the poor. Also, compared to other income groups, the poor segments of the MICs seem to be targeted more significantly and more directly by the Korean government in the planning stage.

### **Relationship between Income/Inequality and AID**

#### ***Programmes/Projects Implemented through NGOs***

I calculated the percentage of ODA disbursement that was delivered through NGOs for MICs and for LDCs/OLICs and compared the values. Even though some papers claim that NGO aid is not a panacea and may prefer following government agency's strategies rules (Nunnenkamp, Weingarth & Weisser, 2009), many others advocate that NGOs, especially local NGOs, are more likely to be closer to the poor. (Nancy & Yontcheva, 2006)

Based on the previous research, a linear regression model was adopted to examine the relationship between the proportion of ODA programmes/projects through NGOs and GDP per capita/GINI coefficient of each recipient country. I took into consideration that some types of aid programmes/projects are not feasible to implement through NGOs, thus these types of ODA were excluded<sup>11</sup>. As a result, two aid types, other technical assistance and project-type interventions, are included in the analysis.

Regarding the recipient countries, the statistics of World Bank do not provide reliable GINI coefficient data for some countries. Thus, only the countries who have GINI coefficient data for the year 1995 or after were considered and the most recent available GINI coefficient of each country was used. This assumes that an inequality level is a relatively long-term trend, so it does not change significantly year by year. Also, countries that did not receive ODA from South Korea in 2015 were excluded<sup>12</sup> to compare ODA from South Korea to ODA from other DAC member countries except for South Korea. As a result, 106 recipient countries were analyzed.

---

<sup>11</sup> These include basket funds/pooled funding, debt relief, general budget support, development awareness, donor country personal, imputed student costs, refugees in donor countries, sector budget support, scholarship/training in donor country, Contributions to specific-purpose programmes and funds managed by international organisations (multilateral, INGO), Core support to NGOs, other private bodies, PPPs and research institutes, and Administrative costs not included elsewhere.

<sup>12</sup> Albania, Argentina, Cabo Verde, Gabon, Kosovo, Mauritania, Mauritius, Montenegro, Sao Tome and Principe, Seychelles, and Suriname were excluded for this reason.

The hypothesis is that if donor countries really focus on the poor in MICs and ODA programmes/projects through NGOs are more likely to target the poor, a positive correlation between ODA through NGOs and GINI coefficient/GDP per capita is expected.

Yet, as Table 3 shows, there is no correlation between GINI coefficient of the recipient countries and ODA through NGOs for them and there is a negative correlation between GDP per capita and ODA through NGOs. And there is no significant difference between ODA from South Korea and ODA from all other DAC member countries except for South Korea

.

Table 3

*Relationship between Income/Inequality and the Proportion of ODA Projects Implemented through NGOs*

	GDP per Capita <sup>a</sup>	GINI coefficient
ODA through NGOs		
Aid from all Other DAC		
Member Countries except for	-19.92***	-0.04
South Korea		
Aid from South Korea	-9.80***	-0.08
Observations	106	106

*Note.* \*\*\*=  $p < .001$ .

<sup>a</sup> log transformed value used

---

### *Programmes/Projects Aimed at Gender Equality*

The target group of pro-poor growth programmes/projects is the poor and disadvantaged people (BMZ, 2006). However, these people are not identical because poverty is multidimensional. It can be deconstructed in many ways including region, ethnicity, gender, age, and many other factors.

Among these factors, I focused on the ODA disbursement aimed at gender equality. I looked into the relationship between an income level and the ODA disbursement aimed at gender equality as well as the relationship between an inequality level and the ODA disbursement aimed at gender equality.

I focused on gender equality for two reasons. First, since the OECD DAC has a reliable gender equality marker system and all DAC member countries follow the marker system, the relationship between an income/inequality level and gender-focused programmes/projects is feasible to analyze.

Secondly, women are socially and economically disadvantaged in most developing countries, thus they need special attention from the international community. In this regard, most donor countries, including South Korea, declared that they would significantly support women through ODA.

A linear regression model was adopted to assess the relationship between the proportion of ODA programmes/projects aimed at gender equality and GINI coefficient/GDP per capita of recipient countries. The OECD DAC gender marker system has three markers for gender equality as policy objectives. Number 2 is given if the principal objective is gender equality and number 1 is given if gender equality is a significant objective. In contrast, if gender equality is not aimed at, number 0 is given. I calculated the proportion of gender-focused programmes/projects by weighting 100 percent for number 2 and 50 percent for number 1.

Regarding recipient countries, like the NGO analysis, the countries which do not have reliable GINI coefficient and/or did not receive ODA from South Korea in 2015 are excluded, thus 106 countries are analyzed.

The hypothesis is that if the donor countries really focus on the poor in MICs and gender is an effective dimension of poverty, a positive correlation between ODA through NGOs and GINI coefficient/GDP per capita is expected.

Yet, as the Table 4 shows, there is no correlation between GINI coefficient of the recipient countries and ODA through NGOs for them and there is a negative correlation between them. And there is no significant difference between ODA from South Korea and ODA from all other DAC member countries except for South Korea.

Table 4

*Relationship between Income/Inequality and the Proportion of ODA Projects Aimed at Gender Equality*

	GDP per Capita <sup>a</sup>	GINI Coefficient
Gender Equality focused ODA		
Aid from all Other DAC	-12.17***	-0.03
Member Countries except for South Korea		
Aid from South Korea	-8.14**	-0.13
Observation	106	106

*Note.* \*\*\*=  $p < .001$ , \*\*=  $p < .01$ .

<sup>a</sup>log transformed value used

### **Bilateral Projects of KOICA**

To analyze the disbursement stage, I analyzed the 250 bilateral projects of KOICA approved for the year 2017<sup>13</sup>. I investigated only bilateral projects for two reasons. First, the bilateral project type is the most important type for KOICA<sup>14</sup>. Over the years, around a half of the total budget of KOICA has been spent on bilateral projects. Second, KOICA has a well-established procedure for selecting projects that take into consideration the development context of recipient countries.

<sup>13</sup> I analyzed the budget of the projects which were approved by the National Assembly for the fiscal year 2017. Thus, the actual disbursement can be different from the budget.

<sup>14</sup> KOICA has various aid types such as bilateral projects, public private partnerships, overseas volunteer program, global training program and multilateral cooperation. (KOICA, 2015)



The 250 bilateral projects also include several "multilateral cooperation projects" following the classification of KOICA. In some cases, a single recipient country is explicitly specified even though they are "multilateral cooperation projects". For example, "UNHCR Community Development Project for Villages in the East/Adamaoua Regions of Cameroon" is classified as a multilateral project at KOICA, but it is included in the analysis because the beneficiary country of the project is clear.

To clearly classify the 250 projects of KOICA, it is necessary to have a definition that we can apply to any project. I adopted the poverty orientation marker of BMZ of Germany (GIZ, 2014), but modified it according to the characteristics of KOICA projects.

The BMZ marker system has three types and it primarily focuses on a target group and an intervention measure. The "direct poverty reduction type" targets an identifiable and definable group within the population, and they are reached directly by the programmes/projects. The "comprehensive poverty reduction type" reaches a poor target group but they are not identifiable and definable. Also, there are projects which intervene in poverty with a general development-policy orientation.

The BMZ marker system is reasonable and reliable because it focuses both targets and intervention measures, thus it provides a basis to analyze how pro-poor

ODA projects are. However, some KOICA bilateral projects are difficult to classify when using the BMZ criteria. Of the 250 projects, 230 fit the BMZ classification meaning that they intend to target the poor using direct measures or target the general public using indirect measures. However, the remaining 20 projects do not fit the classification.

A significant number of projects target the poor using indirect measures. For example, the "Flood Protection and Control Master Plan Project in Sebou River Basin, Morocco" targets the poor, the vulnerable people in Sebou River Basin, but the result chain is relatively long.

On the other hand, some projects target the general public or relatively large territories, but they intervene in them directly such as by educating officers who directly deliver services to the poor. "The Project for the Establishment of the National Farmer's Leadership Center in Uganda" is one example. It targets a large number of farmers in the whole country but by educating officers who are directly in charge of agricultural extension to farmers.

Based on this classification, I categorized the 250 projects into four types: (1) 99 projects for specific target groups using direct measures, (2) 12 projects for specific target groups using indirect measures, (3) 131 projects for indefinable target groups using indirect measures, and (4) 8 projects for indefinable target

groups using indirect measures. Then, I calculated how much each type of aid was provided to each recipient country.

The result shows that only a part of ODA to LMICs/UMICs clearly target the poor and supports pro-poor growth. It shows that 35 percent of the total budget were committed to implement projects for specific target groups using direct measures whereas 58 percent were committed for projects for indefinable target groups using indirect measures. The other two percent and five percent are projects for indefinable target groups using indirect measures and specific target groups using indirect measures respectively.

Compared to other income group, projects for LDCs/OLICs target the poor better and more directly than projects for MICs. The analysis of LDCs/OLICs shows that 50 percent are projects for specific target groups using direct measures whereas 43 percent are projects for indefinable target groups using indirect measures. There are no projects for indefinable target groups using indirect measures nor are there projects for specific target groups using indirect measures.

## **Conclusion**

As the findings show, ODA strategies from South Korea target the poor and aim at poverty reduction. Each CPS for MICs includes at least one priority sector that is explicitly for pro-poor growth even based on the rigorous definition of 'pro-

poor'. In addition, compared to other income groups, ODA to MICs targets the poor better than ODA to LDCs/OLICs.

However, when the strategy is carried out and projects are selected, the priority for the poor is not clear. Fewer projects for MICs are implemented through NGOs than for LDCs/OLICs, and fewer projects for MICs are aimed at gender equality than for LDCs/OLICs. Also, only some of the projects for MICs directly target the poor using direct intervention measures. Compared to other income groups, fewer projects explicitly target the poor and aim at poverty reduction than the projects for LDCs/OLICs.

There are several limitations of the study. First, this thesis has investigated primarily ODA from South Korea. Despite the fact that South Korea is one of the most important emerging donors, the findings from the case might not be generalized to other donors or even other emerging donors. Future work need to be done to investigate more cases and generalize across the cases. These future studies would help us to establish better guidelines for ODA to MICs.

Secondly, I analyzed the intended outputs, outcomes, and objectives of KOICA projects. This means that the actual result and impact of the projects might be different from what they are intended to achieve. To measure its actual impact, we need to evaluate each project after a reasonable period of time. However, this

---

evaluation process requires more resources that are outside of the scope of this thesis. Therefore, this thesis primarily focused on the intention of the projects.

Lastly, given the multidimensional aspect of poverty, the analysis needs to be multidimensional as well. Yet, the OECD DAC and other international development institutions do not have a standardized marker system for other demographic groups such as minor ethnicity, people in isolated territories, or handicapped people. Currently, the only reliable marker system is the gender marker used in this thesis.

I propose that future research should focus on other aspects of poverty. If a standard market system is developed for other dimensions, it would help researchers to investigate the relationship between the development context of recipient countries and the aid allocation for them.

## REFERENCES

- AIMS (2014). A Handbook on Results-Based Management for Sida Research Cooperation. Retrieved from <http://www.sida.se/globalassets/sida/eng/publications/rbm-handbook---2014-full.pdf>
- Cingano, F. (2014), "Trends in Income Inequality and its Impact on Economic Growth", OECD Social, Employment and Migration Working Papers, No. 163, OECD Publishing, Paris, France.
- Chun, H., Munyi, E. N., & Lee, H. (2010). South Korea as an emerging donor: Challenges and changes on its entering OECD/DAC. *Journal of International Development*, 22(6), 788-802. doi:10.1002/jid.1723
- The Committee for International Development Cooperation (2017). 2017 Korea's Official Development Assistance White Paper (Publication No.11-1092000-000004-12). Sejong, South Korea: Author.
- Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (2006), "Pro-Poor Growth" - a focal point of development policy. BMZ Special No 146. Retrieved from [http://www.bmz.de/en/publications/archiv/type\\_of\\_publication/strategies/Special146e.pdf](http://www.bmz.de/en/publications/archiv/type_of_publication/strategies/Special146e.pdf)
- Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs, Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation (2013). The Belgian Development Cooperation in middle-income countries. Strategy Paper. Retrieved from [https://diplomatie.belgium.be/sites/default/files/downloads/note\\_MIC\\_en.pdf](https://diplomatie.belgium.be/sites/default/files/downloads/note_MIC_en.pdf)

- GIZ (2014). The Policy Marker System. DAC Markers/BMZ Markers. Guidelines.  
Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/dac/gender-development/BMZ%202014%20The%20Policy%20Marker%20System.%20DACBMZ%20Markers.%20Guidelines.%20EN.pdf>
- Glennie, J. (2011). The role of aid to middle-income countries: a contribution to evolving European Union (EU) development policy. Working paper, 331. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- Grosse, M., Harttgen, K., & Klasen, S. (2008). Measuring Pro-Poor Growth in Non-Income Dimensions. *World Development*, 36(6), 1021-1047.  
doi:10.1016/j.worlddev.2007.10.009
- Halter, D., Oechslin, M., & Zweimüller, J. (2011). Inequality and Growth: The Neglected Time Dimension. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.  
doi:10.2139/ssrn.1674422
- Herbert, S. (2012). Reassessing aid to middle-income countries: the implications of the European Commission's policy of differentiation for developing countries. Working paper, 349. London: Overseas Development Institute.
- International Monetary Fund (2010). *A Better World for All : Progress Toward the International Development Goals*. Washington: Author.
- Jung, W. (2011). *Hanguk Gaebalhyoepryeokui Chinbingoncheungjeok Gwanjeom Ganghwa Bangan* [Measures to enhance the pro-poor perspectives of Korean development cooperation]. Seongnam, South Korea: KOICA.

- Kakwani, N. & Khandker, S. & Son, H. (2004). Pro-poor growth: concepts and measurement with country case studies, Working Papers 1, International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth
- Kim, E. & Oh, J. (2012). Determinants of Foreign Aid: The Case of South Korea. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 12(2). 251-273. Retrieved from <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-east-asian-studies>
- Korea International Cooperation Agency (2015), 2015 KOICA Annual Report (Publication No. 2016-03-109). Seongnam, South Korea: Author.
- Lumsdaine, D. & Schopf, J.C. (2007), Changing values and the recent rise in Korean development assistance, *The Pacific Review*, 20:2, 221-255. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/rpre20/current>
- Nancy, G., & Yontcheva, B. (2006). Does NGO Aid Go to the Poor? Empirical Evidence From Europe. *IMF Working Papers*, 06(39), 1.  
doi:10.5089/9781451862997.001
- Nunnenkamp, P., Weingarth, J., & Weisser, J. (2009). Is NGO aid not so different after all? Comparing the allocation of Swiss aid by private and official donors. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 25(4), 422-438.  
doi:10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2009.01.001
- OECD (2012). Korea - DAC Peer Reviews of Development Co-operation, 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/dac/peer-reviews/Korea%20CRC%20-%20FINAL%2021%20JAN.pdf>
- OECD (2008). Is it ODA?. Fact sheet. Retrieved from <https://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/34086975.pdf>



---

Ostry, J. (2014). Redistribution, inequality and growth. Washington: International Monetary Fund.

Ravallion, M. (2004). Pro-poor growth : A primer. Policy, Research working paper ; no. WPS3242. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Sumner A. (2011). The new bottom billion: What if most of the world's poor live in middle-income countries. GCD Brief.

Wiggins, S. & Higgins. K. (2008). Pro-poor growth and development. Briefing Papers. London, UK: Overseas Development Institution. Retrived from <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/825.pdf>

## APPENDIX A

### Modified CPS logical Framework<sup>15</sup>

	Activities/Outputs	Outcome	Objectives
Azerbaijan	<b>ICT (Communications)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establishing modern broadband infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Training and educating personnel in communications sector</li> </ul> <b>Water Management and Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establishing water management infrastructure</li> </ul> <b>Public Administration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Developing e-government system</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Transfer agricultural technologies by training and educating</li> </ul>	<b>ICT (Communications)</b>  <b>Water Management and Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of water management and health services for people living in vulnerable areas</li> </ul> <b>Public Administration</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Capacity building of public administration's policy-making</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b>	1. To achieve a knowledge based economic infrastructure 2. - 3. Improvement of productivity, transparency, and efficiency 4. Regional inequality reduction for balanced regional development
Bangladesh	<b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enhancing opportunities for technical and vocational education</li> <li>▪ Providing platform for ICT training</li> </ul> <b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quality enhancement and expansion of transport infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Share expertise on development, operation, and management of transport infrastructure</li> </ul> <b>Water Management and Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establishment of water supply and sewerage systems in priority development areas</li> </ul> <b>ICT(Communications)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reinforcement of technical framework in ICT fields</li> <li>▪ Application of information and communications technology</li> </ul>	<b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expansion and improvement of primary/secondary education and training institutions for disadvantaged communities</li> </ul> <b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expansion of special skill set of workforce</li> </ul> <b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase regional connectivity</li> </ul> <b>Water Management and Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reinforce public health service system, personnel capacities, and maternal and child health service system</li> </ul> <b>ICT(Communications)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Efficient service delivery in the education and governance sector</li> </ul>	1. Improve quality of human resources 2. - 3. - 4. Acceleration of economic growth

<sup>15</sup> See page. 13 for why I modified the framework.

	Activities/Outputs	Outcome	Objectives
Bolivia	<b>Health and Sanitation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support comprehensive and evidence-based health services</li> <li>▪ Universal health coverage (UHC) and a health services system in disadvantaged areas</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support comprehensive rural development</li> <li>▪ The expansion of irrigation facilities and training of agricultural and livestock techniques</li> <li>▪ Expansion of agricultural and livestock value chains</li> </ul> <b>Transportation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support capacity building for integration of transportation systems and development plan</li> <li>▪ Support capacity building for construction, management, and maintenance of transportation infrastructures in key strategic regions</li> </ul> <b>Energy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support small hydroelectric facilities including the establishment of a master plan and construction</li> <li>▪ Infrastructure and capacity building for new and renewable energy, including small hydropower plant focusing on geographically isolated areas</li> </ul>	<b>Health and Sanitation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Disease control and response</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Agricultural and livestock productivities</li> <li>▪ To increase and sustain rural household income</li> </ul> <b>Transportation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To improve access to transportation system and national connectivity (mobility)</li> </ul> <b>Energy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To improve power supply ratio</li> <li>▪ Diversification of power sources and balanced national development</li> <li>▪ Promotion of energy efficiency</li> </ul>	1. Reduction of health inequality 2. - 3. Integration of transportation system 4. Sustainable growth
	<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expansion and rehabilitation of road infrastructures</li> <li>▪ Construction of and consultation on airport and port</li> </ul> <b>Water Management and Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Extension of universal health service</li> </ul> <b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support rural development</li> <li>▪ Support cross-cutting sectors in rural areas</li> </ul>	<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Capacity building for water resource management and disaster response</li> </ul> <b>Water Management and Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Enhancement of public health services</li> </ul> <b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Quality of and access to education</li> <li>▪ Education opportunity for girls and women</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Living condition, income increase and public awareness</li> </ul>	1. - 2. - 3. Human resource development 4. Improved living condition, income and public awareness level

	Activities/Outputs	Outcome	Objectives
Colombia	<b>Regional Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support the implementation of the Rural Transformation Strategy of the National Development Plan</li> <li>▪ Building of social and economic infrastructures to address urban poverty and environmental issues</li> </ul> <b>Transportation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Necessary and adequate infrastructure to encourage multimodal and intermodal transport</li> <li>▪ Promote integrated, articulated, sustainable, and competitive logistics corridors</li> <li>▪ Encourage sustainable public transport models</li> </ul> <b>Industrial Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Promote the development of and the management of public policies on Science, Technology, and Innovation Parks</li> </ul> <b>Post-Conflict</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ laying the basis of community, social, commercial, and public infrastructure including the secondary and tertiary roads in the area of armed conflict</li> </ul>	<b>Regional Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increase agricultural productivity and improve quality of life</li> </ul> <b>Transportation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To enhance productivity and competitiveness (Intermodal Transportation Master Plan 2015-2035)</li> <li>Promote integrated, articulated, sustainable, and competitive logistics corridors</li> <li>▪ To reduce greenhouse gas emissions</li> </ul> <b>Industrial Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improve productivity, industrial competitiveness, and innovation capacity of SMEs and entrepreneurs</li> </ul> <b>Post-Conflict</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strengthen the reintegration process that contributes to peace and reconciliation</li> <li>▪ Promote efficiency, transparency, citizen participation, and accountability in public administration with ICT and other means</li> </ul>	1. Sustainable economic growth, and poverty reduction 2. - 3. - 4. -
	<b>Health and Sanitation</b>  <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support rural infrastructures</li> </ul> <b>Transport and Energy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support transportation infrastructure building</li> <li>▪ Support electricity generation and transmission facilities</li> <li>▪ Support human resource capacity building</li> </ul> <b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support higher education focusing on science, technology and innovation (STI)</li> <li>▪ Support technical vocational education and training</li> </ul>	<b>Health and Sanitation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The improvement of the coverage and quality of health services</li> <li>▪ The prevention and control of communicable diseases</li> <li>▪ The enhancement of access to drinking water and sanitation</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To increase agricultural productivity</li> <li>▪ Promote community organizations of smallholder farmers</li> </ul> <b>Transport and Energy</b>  <b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Education for out-of-school girls and women</li> </ul>	1. - 2. Sustainable rural development 3. Industrialization 4. Enhancing education opportunities

	Activities/Outputs	Outcome	Objectives
Ghana	<b>Agriculture and Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support farmer-based cooperatives and organizations</li> <li>▪ Support rice farming technology and storage, processing, packaging, distribution of other agricultural, and livestock products</li> </ul> <b>Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reproductive health and sanitation programs in schools targeting female adolescent children at schools</li> </ul> <b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strengthen vocational training to meet industrial labor market demand</li> </ul> <b>Energy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construction of power plant</li> <li>▪ Stabilization of power supply to households and industries</li> </ul>	<b>Agriculture and Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To increase agricultural productivity and household income</li> <li>▪ Development of agro-based industry</li> </ul> <b>Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of community-based primary health service delivery and disease control system</li> <li>▪ Improvement of reproductive health of female adolescent children</li> <li>▪ Improvement of access to clean and safe water</li> </ul> <b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of basic education</li> </ul> <b>Energy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of electric power transmission, substation, and distribution efficiency</li> </ul>	1. Comprehensive rural development focusing on regional income disparity 2. - 3. Human resource development 4. -
	<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expansion of intermodal and multimodal transport infrastructures and operation capacity</li> </ul> <b>Governance (Public Administration)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expansion of e-government infrastructure and relevant institutional foundation</li> <li>▪ Promotion of relevant policy reform for e-government system development</li> </ul> <b>Environment Protection</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support forest preservation for the implementation of greenhouse gas management policy and strategy</li> </ul> <b>Water Management</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support human resource development on comprehensive water management system</li> <li>▪ Improvement of infrastructure for water supply and sewerage system and water quality management</li> </ul>	<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of transport infrastructure management capacity and policy development</li> <li>▪ Improvement of interregional and intermodal transport networks with a special focus on geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas and logistical strategic points</li> </ul> <b>Governance (Public Administration)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strengthening of IT-based e-government operation and development capacity</li> <li>▪ Efficient public administration system</li> </ul> <b>Environment Protection</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Greenhouse gas reduction and climate change response</li> <li>▪ Improvement of access to renewable energy</li> </ul> <b>Water Management</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Water management system expansion</li> </ul>	1. - 2. Effective public policies implementation 3. Sustainable environment protection 4. -
Indonesia			

	Activities/Outputs	Outcome	Objectives
Lao PDR	<b>Water Management and Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of access to clean drinking water and</li> <li>▪ Improvement of the coverage of health services and health workforce capacity</li> </ul> <b>Energy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support capacity building for efficient energy use</li> <li>▪ Improvement of electricity coverage</li> </ul> <b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support technical vocational education and training</li> <li>▪ Support secondary and higher education</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support comprehensive rural development</li> </ul>	<b>Water Management and Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of the quality of health services and health workforce capacity</li> </ul> <b>Energy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improved management and utilization of energy resources</li> <li>▪ Improved quality of life and income increase</li> </ul> <b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To foster skilled workers ▪ To nurture high-caliber manpower</li> <li>▪ Improved quality of secondary and higher education and technical vocational education and training</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Poverty reduction and income increase of households in rural areas</li> <li>▪ Improved agricultural productivity</li> </ul>	1. Achievement of national development goal on water supply coverage 2. Economic development 3. National competitiveness 4. Comprehensive rural development
	<b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ TVET policy, curriculum, and facility development based on labor market demands</li> </ul> <b>Water Management and Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support measures to control and prevent noncommunicable diseases and addictive substances</li> </ul> <b>Governance (Public Administration)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The expansion of the e-government system development</li> <li>▪ Reform the hiring and training system of public officials</li> </ul> <b>Transportation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support capacity building for transport and logistics infrastructure development, expansion, and management</li> </ul>	<b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To improve the education environment and access to equal education opportunities for higher education and TVET</li> <li>▪ Enhance the employability of the Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET) program</li> </ul> <b>Water Management and Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strengthen preventive measures for noncommunicable diseases, and reduce regional disparity on the access to improved drinking water sources and sanitary facilities</li> </ul> <b>Governance (Public Administration)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Promote public administrative efficiency and transparency</li> <li>▪ To improve administrative efficiency</li> </ul> <b>Transportation</b>	1. - 2. - 3. - 4. Overall development of the transportation sector, such as transport infrastructure, transportation policies, facilities, and human resources

	Activities/Outputs	Outcome	Objectives
Mozambique	<b>Transport</b> ▪ Establish transportation infrastructure <b>Energy</b> ▪ Establish renewable energy power plants <b>Water Management and Health</b> ▪ Establish a master plan for water management ▪ Expand the health services ▪ Train and strengthen capacities of public officers <b>Education</b> ▪ Improve environment of elementary schools	<b>Transport</b> ▪ Improve transportation environment <b>Energy</b> ▪ Improve power systems <b>Water Management and Health</b> ▪ Improve health environment <b>Education</b> ▪ Improve capacities of vocational training institutions ▪ Strengthen educational capacities	1. Diversify economy 2. resolve environmental issues 3. Improve the quality of life 4. Reduce social inequalities by closing the interregional gaps
Myanmar	<b>Governance</b> ▪ Support improvement of public administration capacity ▪ Support improvement of policy development capacity for inclusive and sustainable economic growth <b>Rural Development</b> ▪ Expansion of agriculture infrastructure, value chain, and export <b>Transport</b> ▪ To develop public transport systems (e.g. urban railways) and residential infrastructure in major cities ▪ Repairing railways and building bridges <b>Energy</b> ▪ Promote the increase of electric power supply ▪ Support energy infrastructure development	<b>Governance</b> ▪ Transparency and efficiency in public governance <b>Rural Development</b> ▪ Development of the agricultural sector and rural areas ▪ To improve agricultural household income, rural living conditions, and access to agricultural finance <b>Transport</b> ▪ To balance growth in urban areas and settle problems of urbanization ▪ Promote regional connectivity and distribution network to enhance national connectivity in Myanmar <b>Energy</b> ▪ To improve the quality of life ▪ Industrial development	1. Inclusive and sustainable economic growth 2. - 3. The facilitation of economic growth and national integration 4. To achieve sustainable economic growth

	Activities/Outputs	Outcome	Objectives
Nepal	<b>Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To expanding child and maternal health services and improving basic health services</li> <li>▪ Implementing health insurance service</li> </ul> <b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To strengthen the capacities of TVET teachers and improve higher education capacities to train young, technical workforce</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support sustainable preservation of natural resources</li> </ul> <b>Energy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The establishment of industrial infrastructure</li> </ul>	<b>Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improving basic health services</li> <li>▪ The establishment of universal health coverage</li> </ul> <b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inclusive rural development focused on strengthening self-sustenance</li> <li>▪ Expansion of agricultural value chain to increase rural income</li> </ul> <b>Energy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To expand hydroelectric power production capacities</li> </ul>	1. - 2. To strengthen national competitiveness and the foundations for economic growth like human development, enlarging human choices, focusing on the richness of human lives rather than economic richness 3. To achieve a balanced national development 4. -
	<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support transport environment improvement projects</li> <li>▪ Establishment of transport infrastructure</li> </ul> <b>Energy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expansion of electric power transmission and transformation facilities and power plants</li> <li>▪ Consultation for electric power system improvement</li> </ul> <b>Water Management and Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support personnel capacity building in the health sector</li> <li>▪ Provision of vaccination and maternal and child health services</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of agricultural technologies and policies</li> <li>▪ Training of agricultural professionals</li> <li>▪ Consulting services on agricultural technologies and policies</li> </ul>	<b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of interregional mobility and accessibility</li> </ul> <b>Energy</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establishment of infrastructure and a comprehensive plan for energy development</li> </ul> <b>Water Management and Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of water quality and water management services</li> <li>▪ Establishment of universal health care and essential elements for healthy lives</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of agricultural productivity</li> <li>▪ Rural development</li> </ul>	1. - 2. - 3. - 4. Reduction of poverty



	Activities/Outputs	Outcome	Objectives
Paraguay	<b>Water Management and Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support establishment of an innovative health system and health service delivery system</li> <li>▪ Improvement of access to water management and health services</li> </ul> <b>Transport</b>	<b>Water Management and Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Capacity development for comprehensive and systematic water resources management and planning</li> </ul> <b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of an interregional logistics and distribution system</li> <li>▪ Improvement of the SOC of transport system</li> </ul>	1. - 2. - 3. - 4. Job creation and new growth engines
	<b>Rural and Urban Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improving self-subsistence capacity of smallholders and family farmers</li> </ul> <b>ICT (Communication)</b> ICT foundation	<b>Rural and Urban Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establishment of a foundation for an ecological city where the nature, people, and environment are in harmony</li> </ul> <b>ICT (Communication)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reduction of digital inequality</li> </ul>	
Peru	<b>Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contribute to the national infectious disease control capacity building program</li> <li>▪ Support primary healthcare service for the vulnerable, low-income groups</li> </ul> <b>Governance (Public Administration)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support e-trade services</li> <li>▪ The development of an e-government system</li> <li>▪ Local government administrative capacity building</li> </ul>	<b>Public Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reinforced public health system, including disease prevention and control, and reduced health inequalities among social groups</li> </ul> <b>Governance (Public Administration)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To strengthen the competitiveness of small and medium-sized import and export enterprises</li> <li>▪ To improve public administrative work efficiency</li> <li>▪ Innovation in ICT-based industry for productive diversification</li> </ul>	1. - 2. National competitiveness 3. Environment protection and sustainable development 4. -
	<b>Climate Change and Environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The development of the marine climate change monitoring system</li> <li>▪ Rainforest (selva) preservation capacity building</li> </ul> <b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The introduction of ITS</li> <li>▪ The improvement of urban transport at metropolitan and major cities as well as the introduction of an integrated metropolitan fare system</li> </ul>	<b>Climate Change and Environment</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Capacity building for mitigation, adaptation and response to climate change</li> </ul> <b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of the transport system, infrastructure, and safety</li> <li>▪ To build transport policy development capacity</li> </ul>	

	Activities/Outputs	Outcome	Objectives
Phillippines	<b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support with the elements of “SaemaeulUndong”</li> <li>▪ Expansion of agricultural infrastructure and technology</li> <li>▪ Strengthening agricultural product value-chain and distribution system</li> <li>▪ Supporting dam and irrigation projects</li> <li>▪ Promote stable supply of agricultural, industrial, and household water supply</li> </ul> <b>Health and Sanitation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improving child nutrition</li> <li>▪ Improve and expand urban and rural water supply and sewerage systems</li> <li>▪ Improved access to water management and distribution system</li> </ul> <b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To improve and build airport, seaport, railroad, and road facilities</li> <li>▪ The strengthening of human resource capacity</li> </ul> <b>Disaster Prevention and Preparedness</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provide support for disaster prevention</li> <li>▪ Promote capacity-building of agencies involved in disaster management</li> </ul>	<b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The development of geographically isolated and disadvantaged areas (GIDA), including its human resources</li> <li>▪ Increase agricultural productivity and household income</li> </ul> <b>Health and Sanitation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improve access to health services beyond geographical, social, and economic limitations</li> <li>▪ Promote healthier lives for children</li> <li>▪ To provide stable health care services and establish health care systems</li> </ul> <b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regional connectivity and sustainable economic growth</li> <li>▪ The development and implementation of transport sector plans and programs</li> </ul> <b>Disaster Prevention and Preparedness</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To minimize injuries and property damage from natural disasters</li> <li>▪ Strengthened disaster prevention and response capacity and disaster risk reduction</li> </ul>	1. Sustainable rural development 2. - 3. - 4. -
	<b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Teacher capacity building for in-service and pre-service teachers in primary, secondary, and TVET schools</li> <li>▪ Support improvement of education policies and institution</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support self-reliance capacity of rural communities</li> </ul> <b>ICT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support the use of ICT in the education sector</li> <li>▪ Support the use of ICT in the agriculture sector</li> <li>▪ Support the use of ICT (<i>in governance sector</i>)</li> </ul>	<b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To meet the demands of the labor market</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of agricultural productivity</li> <li>▪ Rural household income increased</li> </ul> <b>ICT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To strengthen capacity building systems</li> <li>▪ To improve value-added agriculture systems</li> <li>▪ To improve accountable governance systems</li> </ul>	1. - 2. - 3. -

	Activities/Outputs	Outcome	Objectives
Senegal	<b>Rural Development, Agriculture and Fisheries</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support rural development</li> <li>▪ Support the fishery industry</li> </ul> <b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Training of skilled workers</li> </ul> <b>Water Management and Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support local health service focusing on child and maternal health</li> </ul> <b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development of maritime infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Improvement of transport infrastructure and user convenience</li> </ul>	<b>Rural Development, Agriculture and Fisheries</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support agricultural productivity</li> <li>▪ To increase income of fisher folks and job creation</li> </ul> <b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To improve quality and accessibility of education</li> <li>▪ To meet the industrial labor market demand</li> </ul> <b>Water Management and Health</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support sanitation improvement and access to safe drinking water</li> </ul> <b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Improvement of user convenience</li> </ul>	1. Regional disparity reduction 2. Human resources development for sustainable economic growth 3. Better quality of life 4. To consolidate a foundation for economic development
Sri Lanka	<b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support technical and vocational training based on market demand</li> <li>▪ Support science and technology in higher education</li> </ul> <b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support integration of transport management system and management capacity building</li> <li>▪ Building of transport infrastructure</li> </ul> <b>Water Management and Sanitation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support capacity building for water resources and drinking water management</li> <li>▪ Supply of clean water in water-scarce areas</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support modernization of agriculture and fishery sectors</li> <li>▪ Support building of integrative waste management capacity</li> </ul>	<b>Education</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Right to education for adolescent females based on Better Life for Girls initiative</li> <li>▪ Improving education system and capacity</li> </ul> <b>Transport</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To improve connectivity</li> <li>▪ To promote trade and boost tourism</li> </ul> <b>Water Management and Sanitation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Support capacity building for water resources and drinking water management</li> <li>▪ To prevent chronic kidney diseases and respond to environmental changes</li> </ul> <b>Rural Development</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To increase income in rural households</li> <li>▪ Rural development in Northern and Eastern Provinces</li> <li>▪ To improve living environment</li> </ul>	1. Human resource development 2. To improve quality of life 3. - 4. Balanced regional development

	Activities/Outputs	Outcome	Objectives
Tanzania	<b>Water Management and Health</b> ▪ Support health service delivery system <b>Transport</b> ▪ Establishment of systematic assistance strategy in the transportation sector ▪ Construction of transportation infrastructure, transfer of technology and capacity building <b>Education</b> ▪ Support secondary education and vocational education <b>Energy</b> ▪ Construction of energy infrastructures for a stable power supply ▪ Enhancement of energy efficiency and eco-friendly energy supply ▪ Policy consultation and technology transfers based on development experience	<b>Water Management and Health</b> ▪ Access to clean water and public sanitary services focusing on resilience ▪ Basic health services and capacity building <b>Transport</b> ▪ Establishment of basic social infrastructure and capacities <b>Education</b> ▪ Educational environment and quality of education ▪ Education opportunities for girls and women <b>Energy</b> ▪ Capacity building	1. Economic development 2. Sustainable development 3. -
	<b>Rural Development</b> ▪ Support comprehensive rural development reflecting the components of the Saemaul Undong ▪ Support agricultural extension and value chains <b>Education</b> ▪ Support vocational training based on industrial demand for skilled labor ▪ Support capacity building of teachers <b>Health</b> ▪ Support maternal and child health services and local health system with special focus on girls health ▪ Expansion of health facilities, capacity building of health personnel	<b>Rural Development</b> ▪ Agricultural capacity building ▪ To increase agricultural productivity ▪ To increase household income <b>Education</b> ▪ Quality of basic education <b>Health</b> ▪ Efficiency of medical delivery system to increase access to health services	1. Regional development 2. Sustainable human capital development 3. To improve human capital development
Uganda			

	Activities/Outputs	Outcome	Objectives
Uzbekistan	<b>Education</b> ▪ Education informatization <b>Water Management and Health</b> ▪ Diagnostics and treatment system on communicable diseases <b>Public Administration</b> ▪ Building of e-government system	<b>Education</b> ▪ Improvement of the quality of vocational education and training <b>Water Management and Health</b> ▪ Strengthening of water resource management capacity ▪ Expansion of welfare service for infants and young children <b>Public Administration</b> ▪ Strengthening public administrative capacities	1. Improvement of human resources development for national competitiveness 2. Improved national welfare 3. Improved government efficiency
	<b>Transport</b> ▪ Contribute to transport sectoral policy development including railway and road systems and management capacity building ▪ Expand cooperation in the area of railway including metro system ▪ Support building of key national transportation networks through public-private partnerships <b>Water Management and Healthcare</b> ▪ Support capacity building for water management and disease control as a response to climate change ▪ A comprehensive rural development project ▪ Expansion of water, sewerage, and industrial waste treatment facilities in major cities ▪ Establishment of special care hospitals <b>Governance (Public Administration)</b>  <b>Education</b> ▪ Training of skilled professionals in fields relevant to modern and industrialized Vietnam including science and technology, environment, international law, and dispute settlement	<b>Transport</b>  <b>Water Management and Healthcare</b> ▪ Support capacity building for water management and disease control as a response to climate change ▪ Improvement of basic healthcare and sanitation ▪ To strengthen public health services <b>Governance (Public Administration)</b> ▪ Strengthening of various public administrative capacities linked to economic, social, and environmental development and governance ▪ Promotion of market economy and improvement of business environment including relevant legal system ▪ Strengthening of public administration capacity focused on vulnerable groups and social integration <b>Education</b> ▪ Social inclusion of vulnerable groups through education	1. Balanced regional development 2. Mid-to-long term health sector development 3. Implementation of mid-term national development plan 4. -

*Note.* I did not change the original phrases of the CPSs. If the same content is repeated more than twice, I included only one of them in the log frame.

## APPENDIX B

### Proportion of Bilateral ODA Disbursement through NGOs by Recipient Country

Income Group	Country	From South Korea	From all others except for Korea	GINI coefficient	GDP per capita (in \$)
LDC	Angola	0.00%	54.18%	42.72	3,696
LDC	Bangladesh	3.49%	22.00%	32.13	1,210
LDC	Benin	0.00%	33.19%	43.44	784
LDC	Bhutan	0.00%	11.06%	38.81	2,614
LDC	Burkina Faso	31.36%	35.28%	35.3	616
LDC	Burundi	48.59%	47.18%	33.36	304
LDC	Cambodia	3.65%	20.80%	30.76	1,163
LDC	Central African Republic	0.00%	57.55%	56.24	348
LDC	Chad	0.00%	49.02%	43.32	777
LDC	Comoros	0.00%	0.92%	55.93	728
LDC	Congo	0.00%	12.08%	48.94	1,712
LDC	DR Congo	0.00%	54.62%	42.1	475
LDC	Djibouti	0.00%	5.53%	44.13	1,862
LDC	Ethiopia	2.29%	40.99%	33.17	645
LDC	Gambia	0.00%	9.03%	47.33	475
LDC	Guinea	0.00%	39.11%	33.73	554
LDC	Guinea-Bissau	0.00%	40.06%	50.66	597
LDC	Haiti	0.00%	29.21%	60.79	815
LDC	Kiribati	0.00%	4.76%	37.61	1,424
LDC	Lao PDR	1.64%	13.75%	37.89	2,159
LDC	Lesotho	0.00%	51.62%	54.18	1,074
LDC	Liberia	0.00%	49.55%	36.48	452
LDC	Madagascar	0.00%	69.48%	42.65	402
LDC	Malawi	76.45%	37.85%	46.12	363
LDC	Mali	4.63%	45.13%	33.04	730
LDC	Mozambique	1.27%	21.78%	45.58	528
LDC	Nepal	10.39%	39.14%	32.84	744
LDC	Niger	79.92%	40.06%	33.99	359
LDC	Rwanda	5.19%	23.52%	50.44	710
LDC	Senegal	11.67%	15.23%	40.29	909
LDC	Sierra Leone	0.00%	50.08%	33.99	588
LDC	Solomon Islands	0.00%	12.55%	46.1	1,922
LDC	South Sudan	0.00%	49.68%	46.34	759
LDC	Sudan	0.00%	43.79%	35.39	2,514

Income Group	Country	From South Korea	From all others except for Korea	GINI coefficient	GDP per capita (in \$)
LDC	Tanzania	3.83%	23.38%	37.78	872
LDC	Timor-Leste	4.27%	19.91%	31.56	1,162
LDC	Togo	0.00%	7.27%	46.02	551
LDC	Tuvalu	0.00%	0.30%	41.1	2,970
LDC	Uganda	10.55%	25.87%	41.01	694
LDC	Vanuatu	0.00%	10.81%	37.19	2,806
LDC	Zambia	0.00%	32.71%	55.62	1,314
OLIC	Kenya	24.08%	26.08%	48.51	1,350
OLIC	Tajikistan	0.00%	17.87%	37.78	872
OLIC	Zimbabwe	0.00%	60.08%	43.15	1,019
LMIC	Armenia	0.00%	16.77%	31.48	3,610
LMIC	Bolivia	3.73%	33.77%	48.4	3,077
LMIC	Cameroon	0.00%	9.12%	46.54	1,244
LMIC	Cote d'Ivoire	0.00%	2.96%	43.18	1,421
LMIC	El Salvador	0.00%	31.37%	41.84	4,127
LMIC	Georgia	0.00%	19.53%	40.09	3,765
LMIC	Ghana	0.52%	26.42%	42.77	1,361
LMIC	Guatemala	16.23%	48.82%	48.66	3,924
LMIC	Guyana	0.00%	28.79%	44.55	4,137
LMIC	Honduras	0.00%	24.26%	50.64	2,326
LMIC	India	0.00%	2.72%	35.15	1,613
LMIC	Indonesia	0.30%	5.92%	39.47	3,336
LMIC	Kyrgyzstan	2.73%	19.84%	26.82	1,121
LMIC	Micronesia	0.00%	5.18%	42.46	3,016
LMIC	Moldova	0.00%	15.03%	26.83	1,832
LMIC	Mongolia	3.90%	5.66%	32.04	3,944
LMIC	Morocco	5.34%	3.94%	40.72	2,847
LMIC	Nicaragua	0.00%	48.06%	47.05	2,096
LMIC	Nigeria	0.00%	39.68%	42.97	2,655
LMIC	Pakistan	0.00%	17.40%	30.69	1,431
LMIC	Papua New Guinea	0.00%	6.79%	43.88	2,183
LMIC	Paraguay	5.05%	38.62%	51.67	4,109
LMIC	Philippines	3.79%	16.62%	43.04	2,878
LMIC	Samoa	0.00%	3.17%	42.69	4,149
LMIC	Sri Lanka	1.69%	7.88%	39.16	3,845
LMIC	Swaziland	0.00%	53.66%	51.45	3,137
LMIC	Ukraine	0.00%	22.25%	24.09	2,125
LMIC	Uzbekistan	0.00%	2.45%	35.27	2,138
LMIC	Viet Nam	1.08%	3.41%	37.59	2,107
LMIC	West Bank	0.00%	32.53%	34.46	2,866

Income Group	Country	From South Korea	From all others except for Korea	GINI coefficient	GDP per capita (in \$)
	and Gaza Strip				
UMIC	Azerbaijan	0.00%	13.91%	31.79	5,500
UMIC	Belarus	0.00%	52.42%	27.18	5,949
UMIC	Belize	0.00%	31.26%	53.26	4,850
UMIC	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.00%	21.94%	33.83	4,574
UMIC	Botswana	0.00%	19.23%	60.46	6,532
UMIC	Brazil	0.00%	3.75%	51.48	8,757
UMIC	Chile	0.00%	4.19%	50.45	13,653
UMIC	China	0.00%	3.32%	42.16	8,069
UMIC	Colombia	0.00%	10.33%	53.5	6,045
UMIC	Costa Rica	0.00%	2.80%	48.53	11,406
UMIC	Dominican Republic	0.00%	5.38%	47.07	6,468
UMIC	Ecuador	3.85%	11.79%	45.38	6,205
UMIC	Fiji	34.25%	12.57%	42.78	4,922
UMIC	Gabon	0.00%	10.15%	42.18	7,389
UMIC	Iran	0.00%	12.06%	37.35	4,958
UMIC	Jamaica	0.00%	16.82%	45.46	4,966
UMIC	Kazakhstan	0.00%	17.61%	26.33	10,510
UMIC	Malaysia	0.00%	6.75%	46.26	9,644
UMIC	Maldives	0.00%	1.35%	38.37	8,396
UMIC	Mexico	0.00%	5.83%	48.21	9,143
UMIC	Namibia	0.00%	14.18%	60.97	4,738
UMIC	Panama	0.00%	30.35%	50.7	13,134
UMIC	Peru	1.74%	15.14%	44.14	6,030
UMIC	Saint Lucia	0.00%	0.70%	42.58	8,076
UMIC	Serbia	0.00%	14.29%	29.06	5,237
UMIC	South Africa	0.00%	11.05%	63.38	5,770
UMIC	Thailand	0.00%	14.20%	37.85	5,815
UMIC	Tonga	0.00%	5.89%	38.1	4,094
UMIC	Tunisia	3.09%	8.69%	35.81	3,828
UMIC	Turkey	0.00%	8.08%	40.18	10,980
UMIC	Turkmenistan	0.00%	19.96%	40.77	6,433
UMIC	Uruguay	0.00%	2.80%	41.6	15,525



## APPENDIX C

### Proportion of Bilateral ODA Disbursement Aimed at Gender Equality by Recipient

County					
Income Group	Country	From South Korea	From all others except for Korea	GINI coefficient	GDP per capita (in \$)
LDC	Angola	0.00%	44.18%	42.72	3,696
LDC	Bangladesh	11.87%	30.38%	32.13	1,210
LDC	Benin	0.00%	26.74%	43.44	784
LDC	Bhutan	0.00%	11.92%	38.81	2,614
LDC	Burkina Faso	27.31%	31.94%	35.3	616
LDC	Burundi	0.00%	35.18%	33.36	304
LDC	Cambodia	8.29%	23.23%	30.76	1,163
LDC	Central African Republic	0.00%	19.40%	56.24	348
LDC	Chad	0.00%	11.04%	43.32	777
LDC	Comoros	0.00%	25.05%	55.93	728
LDC	Congo	0.00%	14.79%	48.94	1,712
LDC	DR Congo	44.14%	25.56%	42.1	475
LDC	Djibouti	0.00%	8.24%	44.13	1,862
LDC	Ethiopia	13.85%	30.21%	33.17	645
LDC	Gambia	0.00%	5.86%	47.33	475
LDC	Guinea	0.00%	20.24%	33.73	554
LDC	Guinea-Bissau	0.00%	16.60%	50.66	597
LDC	Haiti	34.30%	19.08%	60.79	815
LDC	Kiribati	0.00%	38.19%	37.61	1,424
LDC	Lao PDR	3.91%	17.01%	37.89	2,159
LDC	Lesotho	15.16%	15.64%	54.18	1,074
LDC	Liberia	0.00%	18.67%	36.48	452
LDC	Madagascar	0.00%	19.95%	42.65	402
LDC	Malawi	18.22%	30.53%	46.12	363
LDC	Mali	7.15%	30.89%	33.04	730
LDC	Mozambique	4.10%	25.53%	45.58	528
LDC	Nepal	16.44%	26.97%	32.84	744
LDC	Niger	79.92%	24.08%	33.99	359
LDC	Rwanda	30.69%	35.58%	50.44	710
LDC	Senegal	9.91%	21.67%	40.29	909
LDC	Sierra Leone	0.00%	18.23%	33.99	588
LDC	Solomon Islands	27.80%	25.08%	46.1	1,922

Income Group	Country	From South Korea	From all others except for Korea	GINI coefficient	GDP per capita (in \$)
LDC	South Sudan	0.00%	21.66%	46.34	759
LDC	Sudan	41.36%	11.12%	35.39	2,514
LDC	Tanzania	8.24%	34.72%	37.78	872
LDC	Timor-Leste	38.00%	27.99%	31.56	1,162
LDC	Togo	1.17%	23.47%	46.02	551
LDC	Tuvalu	0.00%	7.29%	41.1	2,970
LDC	Uganda	10.13%	28.07%	41.01	694
LDC	Vanuatu	0.00%	15.33%	37.19	2,806
LDC	Zambia	28.97%	32.25%	55.62	1,314
OLIC	Kenya	8.79%	24.51%	48.51	1,350
OLIC	Tajikistan	0.00%	26.78%	37.78	872
OLIC	Zimbabwe	4.45%	35.22%	43.15	1,019
LMIC	Armenia	0.00%	14.34%	31.48	3,610
LMIC	Bolivia	8.30%	34.79%	48.4	3,077
LMIC	Cameroon	0.19%	10.78%	46.54	1,244
LMIC	Cote d'Ivoire	1.36%	6.98%	43.18	1,421
LMIC	El Salvador	1.51%	26.92%	41.84	4,127
LMIC	Georgia	9.29%	14.67%	40.09	3,765
LMIC	Ghana	10.42%	37.41%	42.77	1,361
LMIC	Guatemala	26.06%	38.64%	48.66	3,924
LMIC	Guyana	0.00%	8.52%	44.55	4,137
LMIC	Honduras	0.41%	19.34%	50.64	2,326
LMIC	India	0.00%	14.70%	35.15	1,613
LMIC	Indonesia	1.05%	13.86%	39.47	3,336
LMIC	Kyrgyzstan	0.00%	14.90%	26.82	1,121
LMIC	Micronesia	0.00%	1.23%	42.46	3,016
LMIC	Moldova	7.53%	24.91%	26.83	1,832
LMIC	Mongolia	1.95%	7.38%	32.04	3,944
LMIC	Morocco	9.31%	13.75%	40.72	2,847
LMIC	Nicaragua	0.05%	26.80%	47.05	2,096
LMIC	Nigeria	22.41%	29.87%	42.97	2,655
LMIC	Pakistan	11.08%	28.21%	30.69	1,431
LMIC	Papua New Guinea	29.51%	31.41%	43.88	2,183
LMIC	Paraguay	3.10%	23.78%	51.67	4,109
LMIC	Philippines	9.00%	9.47%	43.04	2,878
LMIC	Samoa	7.77%	21.66%	42.69	4,149
LMIC	Sri Lanka	2.13%	13.05%	39.16	3,845
LMIC	Swaziland	1.19%	21.87%	51.45	3,137
LMIC	Ukraine	2.45%	9.06%	24.09	2,125
LMIC	Uzbekistan	0.29%	2.78%	35.27	2,138

Income Group	Country	From South Korea	From all others except for Korea	GINI coefficient	GDP per capita (in \$)
LMIC	Viet Nam	2.35%	4.99%	37.59	2,107
LMIC	West Bank and Gaza Strip	8.23%	24.58%	34.46	2,866
UMIC	Azerbaijan	32.43%	6.21%	31.79	5,500
UMIC	Belarus	9.52%	10.92%	27.18	5,949
UMIC	Belize	0.00%	2.35%	53.26	4,850
UMIC	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0.00%	15.20%	33.83	4,574
UMIC	Botswana	0.00%	7.91%	60.46	6,532
UMIC	Brazil	0.00%	6.59%	51.48	8,757
UMIC	Chile	0.00%	8.66%	50.45	13,653
UMIC	China	12.18%	7.72%	42.16	8,069
UMIC	Colombia	9.27%	22.58%	53.5	6,045
UMIC	Costa Rica	2.86%	2.62%	48.53	11,406
UMIC	Dominican Republic	0.11%	35.62%	47.07	6,468
UMIC	Ecuador	3.38%	11.10%	45.38	6,205
UMIC	Fiji	3.38%	32.63%	42.78	4,922
UMIC	Gabon	0.00%	8.67%	42.18	7,389
UMIC	Iran	0.00%	8.86%	37.35	4,958
UMIC	Jamaica	0.00%	13.11%	45.46	4,966
UMIC	Kazakhstan	0.64%	5.97%	26.33	10,510
UMIC	Malaysia	0.00%	3.61%	46.26	9,644
UMIC	Maldives	0.00%	8.96%	38.37	8,396
UMIC	Mexico	0.00%	6.22%	48.21	9,143
UMIC	Namibia	0.00%	20.24%	60.97	4,738
UMIC	Panama	0.00%	2.77%	50.7	13,134
UMIC	Peru	20.90%	16.76%	44.14	6,030
UMIC	Saint Lucia	0.00%	8.96%	42.58	8,076
UMIC	Serbia	0.00%	13.69%	29.06	5,237
UMIC	South Africa	4.95%	5.45%	63.38	5,770
UMIC	Thailand	0.41%	9.76%	37.85	5,815
UMIC	Tonga	0.00%	14.54%	38.1	4,094
UMIC	Tunisia	2.04%	14.74%	35.81	3,828
UMIC	Turkey	0.00%	6.35%	40.18	10,980
UMIC	Turkmenistan	2.06%	8.97%	40.77	6,433
UMIC	Uruguay	0.00%	4.13%	41.6	15,525

## APPENDIX D

### KOICA Bilateral Project Classification by Target and Measure

Country	Indefinable Target using Direct Measures	indefinable target using indirect measures	Specific Target using Direct Measures	Specific Target using Indirect Measures	Total Budget
Afghanistan			1,071		1,071
Angola		100	1,000		1,100
Bangladesh		4,988	2,110	637	7,735
Cambodia		5,100	5,203	978	11,281
DR Congo	1,300	3,000	200		4,500
Ethiopia		2,916	10,669	1,000	14,585
Lao PDR		6,989	4,611		11,600
Mali			350		350
Mozambique		4,300	2,300		6,600
Myanmar		10,933	5,967	100	17,000
Nepal		700	4,713		5,413
Rwanda	50	4,650	1,650		6,350
Senegal		700	4,775		5,475
Solomon Islands		922	1,154		2,076
Sudan	800		500		1,300
Tanzania		1,581	5,600	921	8,102
Timor-Leste	2,744	1,000	1,482		5,226
Uganda	300	2,450	4,934		7,684
<b>LDCs Total</b>	<b>5,194</b>	<b>50,329</b>	<b>58,289</b>	<b>3,636</b>	<b>117,448</b>
Kenya		500	1,000		1,500
Tajikistan			50		50
<b>OLICs Total</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>1,050</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>1,550</b>
Bolivia		1,000	5,450		6,450
Cameroon		2,230	2,300		4,530
Cote d'Ivoire		4,353	1,500		5,853
Egypt		500			500
El Salvador		1,000	2,000		3,000
Ghana		900	1,838		2,738
Guatemala		1,000	1,000		2,000
Honduras		1,000			1,000
Indonesia		3,224	1,400		4,624
Kyrgyzstan		8,100	50		8,160
Mongolia		2,278		1,464	3,742
Morocco		1,300		1,699	2,999
Nicaragua	100	300			400

Country	Indefinable Target using Direct Measures	indefinable target using indirect measures	Specific Target using Direct Measures	Specific Target using Indirect Measures	Total Buget
Nigeria		3,850	2,800		6,650
Pakistan		1,038			1,038
Paraguay		837	3,816		4,653
Philippines		2,800	10,291	2,275	15,366
Sri Lanka	1,000	1,668	800		3,468
Uzbekistan		8,672	700		9,372
Viet Nam		20,835	6,438		27,273
West Bank and Gaza Strip		3,050	1,550	500	5,100
<b>LMICs Total</b>	<b>1,100</b>	<b>69,935</b>	<b>41,933</b>	<b>5,938</b>	<b>118,916</b>
Algeria		900			900
Azerbaijan	1,185		50		1,235
China		300			300
Colombia		2,991		880	3,871
Dominican Republic		630			630
Ecuador		700	2,300		3,000
Fiji			1,150		1,150
Iran		150			150
Iraq		2,000	2,400		4,400
Jordan		2,600	2,600		5,200
Lebanon		50			50
Peru		3,200	2,700	500	6,400
South Africa		400			400
Tunisia		3,936	320		4,256
Turkmenista n		100			100
<b>UMICs Total</b>	<b>1,185</b>	<b>17,957</b>	<b>11,520</b>	<b>1,380</b>	<b>32,042</b>
<b>All Recipients Total</b>	<b>7,479</b>	<b>138,721</b>	<b>112,792</b>	<b>10,954</b>	<b>269,956</b>

*Note.* All values are in 1 million Korean Won (KRW)